UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/427,238	10/26/1999	SHARAD KAPUR	KAPUR5-10	2915

7590 01/28/2003

DAVID H HITT
HITT CHWANG & GAINES P C
P.O. BOX 832570
RICHARDSON, TX 75083

EXAMINER	
GARCIA OTERO, EDUARDO	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2123	12

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/427,238	KAPUR ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Eduardo Garcia-Otero	2123

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2002 .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 02 December 2002 is: a)☐ approved b)☒ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION-Final Action

Introduction

1. Title is: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DETERMINING CAPACITANCE FOR LARGE-SCALE INTEGRATED CIRCUITS
2. Applicant is: KAPUR et al.
3. Filed 10/26/99, no domestic or foreign priority claimed.
4. Claims 1-21 have been submitted, examined, and rejected.
5. This is the second action on the merits, and is a Final Action.
6. Some new grounds of rejection for lack of enablement are introduced, which were necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

Index

7. **Belk** refers to Belk, US Patent 6,397,171 filed Apr. 1, 1999.
8. **Nabors** refers to PRECONDITIONED, ADAPTIVE, MULTIPOLE-ACCELERATED ITERATION METHODS FOR THREE-DIMENSIONAL FIRST-KIND INTEGRAL EQUATIONS OF POTENTIAL THEORY", K. Nabors et al, Siam Journal on Scientific Computing, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 713-735, May 1994.
9. **Edgecombe** refers to Edgecombe et al., US Patent 6,345,235 filed
10. **Dufour** refers to Dufour, US Patent 6,351,572.

Request for Information (for the second time)

11. The Examiner requests copies of the following publications because they appear to be especially germane to the claimed invention. In responding to this request, where the

document is a bound text or a single article over 50 pages, the request may be met by providing copies of those pages that provide the relevant subject matter. See MPEP 704.14.

12. The Examiner requests (for the second time): the document that was mentioned in the IDS, but was not submitted: INTRODUCTION TO NUMERICAL ANALYSIS," by J. Soer and R. Bulirsh, Springer Verlag 1979.
13. In response to the first request, Applicant states at Remarks page 14 "The Applicants believe that a copy of this text book does not need to be submitted due to its voluminous nature and since the text book was only cited as a background reference". However, because this document was listed on an IDS, the Examiner believes the record would be more clear if the document was submitted. Since it is a "voluminous" textbook, submitting the most relevant pages plus the table of contents should be sufficient. See MPEP 704.14.

Amendments to Drawing and specification-objection new matter

14. The drawing changes filed 12/2/02 are objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because they introduce new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:
15. **FIG 2B is objected to as introducing new matter.** Note that specification page 11 line 18-20 states "If the charge distribution function is not within acceptable limits, the geometry is subdivided into smaller geographic elements called subdivision." However, in FIG 2B, it is possible for the charge distribution function to not be within acceptable limits, but yet not perform subdivisions. Note the path elements 270, 280, 282, and 295 begins with a charge distribution function not within acceptable limits and then reaches element 295 END without

any subdivision. Similarly, the path element 270, 280, 282, 287, 280, 282, and 295 also begins with a charge distribution function not within acceptable limits and then reaches element 295 END without any subdivision. Thus, FIG 2B is objected to. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action. See MPEP 706.03(o) and 706.07(h)(VII).

16. Applicant's amendments to FIG 2 (renamed as FIG 2A), and to the specification do not introduce new matter.

Specification- incorporation—objection withdrawn

17. The objections to incorporation by reference are withdrawn because the publications are merely background information.

Specification-objections--COARSE

18. At specification Page 10 lines 4-9 (as amended per marked-up version at page 21 of Amendment received 12/02/02) states "FIGURE 1, the net C1 and the net C2 are captured with relatively detailed geometric descriptions. However, the net C3 [is] may be captured with relatively **coarse geometric descriptions**." However, it appears to Examiner that FIG 1 shows C3 with the same level of detail as C1 and C2. Even after amendment, the specification still classifies/groups C3 differently than C1 and C2.

19. Remarks, page 14, Applicant unpersuasively asserts "C3, therefore, does represent a more coarse description than C1 or C2 since C3 represents a larger area". It is possible that C3 does indeed represent a larger area, but this has little bearing on coarseness. "Coarse" is defined as "...not precise or detailed with respect to adjustment or discrimination" by Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Tenth Edition. Thus, in the context of the

specification, "coarse" appears to refer to using relatively large blocks to define space, in contrast to relatively small blocks. The fact that C3 represents a larger area appears unrelated to the coarseness of the description. C1, C2, and C2 each have one relatively large block, and one or more smaller blocks. Therefore, they all appear to have about the same level of coarseness. Thus, this objection is not withdrawn.

20. Note that specification page 9 lines 11 to 18 states, "net C3 to be replaced with a simpler geometric description, the number of unknowns could be reduced…constrained by the charge distribution, rather than the geometry of the nets".

Specification-objections

21. The Specification is objected to as not clear, and ambiguous, and possibly contradictory.

22. First, specification Paragraph at Page 4 lines 9-14 states "(2) a conductive geometry generator, associated with the charge variation generator, that creates a conductive geometry that is independent of charge variation in the structure, the charge variation function and the conductive geometry employable in the integral equation formulation to reduce a complexity thereof."

23. The Examiner interprets the specification as: "(2) a conductive geometry generator, associated with the charge variation generator. The conductive geometry generator creates a conductive geometry that is independent of (a) charge variation in the structure, (b) the charge variation function and (c) the conductive geometry. The conductive geometry generator is employable in the integral equation formulation to reduce a complexity thereof."

24. **It is not clear how the "conductive geometry generator" can be independent of "(c) the conductive geometry".** Therefore, the Examiner suggests that this paragraph be rewritten in

a more clear fashion. Note that this issue bears on the objection for new matter, and also bears on the rejections for lack of enablement.

Claim Rejections-35 USC § 112-first paragraph (Enablement)

25. **Remarks, page 16.** Based on Applicant's persuasive assertions, the prior enablement and indefiniteness rejections for the term "integral equation formulation" are withdrawn. However, to keep the record clear, note that this term occurs not just in the preamble, but also in the second limitation of Claim 1 at page 30 line 11. Thus, this is an explicit limitation and not merely an intended use. The Examiner interprets this term ("integral equation formulation") broadly to mean any description of capacitance which includes or is derived from at least one integral equation.

26. **A new rejection is presented below, based upon and necessitated by the amendment, new FIG 2B.**

27. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

28. **Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not enabled,** as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

29. Specifically, independent claims 1, 8, and 15 all state **"multidimensional charge variation function that is independent of a conductive geometry of said structure".** First, note that "charge variation function" is used interchangeably with "charge distribution function". Second, note that in FIG 2B the "charge distribution function" is determined based upon the

"initial charge distribution and geometry" (element 265 follows element 260). Third, note that "refine charge variation function" may be determined based upon "subdivide geometry into subdivisions (element 280 may follow element 290). Thus, both the initial and the refined charge variation functions (or charge distribution functions) are not independent of the conductive geometry of said structure. Rather, the initial and the refined charge variation functions are directly dependent upon the initial geometry, and the refined charge variation function may be dependent upon the subdivided geometry.

30. **Remarks, page 17-19.** The Applicant persuasively asserts that Belk does not teach "charge variation function that is independent of a conductive geometry of the capacitive structure". This is the only claimed limitation which the Applicant specifically asserts is not disclosed by the prior art.
31. Note that the present invention does not enable a charge variation function independent of a conductive geometry, and all claims are rejected as not enabled for this reason.
32. Additionally, even if "independent of a conductive geometry" is interpreted to mean "derived from the conductive geometry" (which appears to be the intention of the present application), then Belk does teach a charge variation function that is "derived from the conductive geometry".
33. Therefore, Applicant's assertions that Belk does not anticipate claims 1 and 8 are not persuasive.
34. **Thus, all prior art claim rejections are maintained without change, and are repeated below.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(e)

35. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

36. A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

37. (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

38. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

39. Claims 1, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

40. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Belk.

41. Claim 1 is an independent claim with 2 limitations

42. **a charge variation function generator that creates a multidimensional charge variation function that is independent of a conductive geometry of said structure** is disclosed by Belk "charge distributions" at Column 12 line 33.

43. **a conductive geometry generator... that creates a conductive geometry that is independent of charge in said structure** is disclosed by Belk "metalization structures" at Column 2 line 48.

44. **Claim 8 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

45. Claim 8 is an independent "method" claim with the same limitations as "system" Claim 1, and therefore is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

46. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

47. A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

48. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

49. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
50. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
51. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
52. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

53. **Claims 2-7, 9-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable.**

54. **Claim 2 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Stalzer.

55. Claim 2 depends from Claim 1, with one additional limitation.

56. Belk does not expressly disclose the additional limitation:

57. **Fast Distributed Method (FDM)** is disclosed by Stalzer at Column 1 line 15 Fast Multipole Method and at Column 2 line 13 "cube".

58. **At the time** the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Stalzer to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do this because "two dimensional or quasi two dimensional processes...yield very inaccurate results" according to Belk Column 1 lines 38-41.

59. **<u>Claim 3 is rejected</u>** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Nabors.

60. Claim 3 depends from Claim 1, with one additional limitation.

61. Belk does not expressly disclose the additional limitation:

62. **charge variation function is a three-dimensional function** is disclosed by Nabors at Abstract "three-dimensional, first-kind, integral equations that arise in potential theory". **At the time** the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Nabors to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because "two dimensional or quasi two dimensional processes...yield very inaccurate results" according to Belk Column 1 lines 38-41. Furthermore, all real charge distributions are three dimensional.

63. **<u>Claim 4 is rejected</u>** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Edgecombe.

64. Claim 4 depends from Claim 1, with one additional limitation.

65. Belk does not expressly disclose the additional limitation:

66. **charge variation function is a smooth function of spatial location** is disclosed by Edgecombe at Column 12 line 32 "smooth function".

67. **At the time** the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Edgecombe to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do this because "The preferred principal characteristics that we want in our interpolant are robustness and smoothness" according to Edgecombe Column 12 line 36.

68. **Claim 5 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Nabors.

69. Claim 5 depends from Claim 1, with one additional limitation.

70. Belk does not expressly disclose the additional limitation:

71. **conductive geometry generator iteratively creates said conductive geometry** is disclosed by Nabors at Abstract "iterative".

72. **At the time** the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Nabors to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this "because the accelerated method is substantially faster than standard algorithms" according to Nabors Abstract.

73. **Claim 6 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Nabors.

74. Claim 6 depends from Claim 1, with one additional limitation.

75. Belk does not expressly disclose the additional limitation:

76. **said charge variation function generator employs a generalized minimal residual-based Krylov method to determine said multidimensional charge variation function** is disclosed by Nabors at Abstract "Krylov-subspace iterative algorithm".

77. **At the time** the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Nabors to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do this "because the accelerated method is substantially faster than standard algorithms" according to Nabors Abstract.

78. <u>Claim 7 is rejected</u> under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Dufour.

79. Claim 7 depends from Claim 1, with one additional limitation.

80. Belk does not expressly disclose the additional limitation:

81. **said conductive geometry is represented in an octtree** is disclosed by Dufour at Column 2 line 6 "octree subdividion of the 3D space"".

82. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Dufour to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because "octrees are an efficient representation for many volumetric objects since there is a large degree of coherence between adjacent voxels in a typical object" according to Dufour at Column 2 line 14.

83. **<u>Claim 9-14 are rejected</u>** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

84. Claims 9-14 are "method" claims with the same limitations as "system" Claims 2-7, and therefore are rejected for the same reasons.

85. <u>Claim 15 is rejected</u> under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Nabors.

86. Claim 15 is an independent claim with 3 limitations.

87. **1-a charge variation function generator that creates a multidimensional charge variation function that is independent of a conductive geometry of said integrated circuit** is disclosed by Belk "charge distributions" at Column 12 line 33.

88. **2-a conductive geometry generator that creates a conductive geometry that is independent of charge in said integrated circuit** is disclosed by Belk "metalization structures" at Column 2 line 48.

89. Belk does not expressly disclose the third limitation:

90. **3-an integral equation formulator, associated with said charge variation generator and conductive geometry generator, that determines said capacitance of said integrated circuit** is disclosed by Nabors at Abstract "integral equations".

91. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Nabors to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this "because the accelerated method is substantially faster than standard algorithms" according to Nabors Abstract.

92. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Nabors and Stalzer.

93. Claim 16 depends from Claim 15, with one additional limitation.

94. Belk does not expressly disclose the additional limitation:

95. **Fast Distributed Method (FDM)** is disclosed by Stalzer at Column 1 line 15 Fast Multipole Method and at Column 2 line 13 "cube".

96. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Stalzer to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because "two dimensional or quasi two dimensional processes...yield very inaccurate results" according to Belk Column 1 lines 38-41.

97. **<u>Claim 17 is rejected</u>** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Nabors.

98. Claim 17 depends from Claim 15, with one additional limitation.

99. Belk does not expressly disclose the additional limitation:

100. **charge variation function is a three-dimensional function** is disclosed by Nabors at Abstract "three-dimensional, first-kind, integral equations that arise in potential theory". **At the time** the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Nabors to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because "two dimensional or quasi two dimensional processes...yield very inaccurate results" according to Belk Column 1 lines 38-41, and "because the accelerated method is substantially faster than standard algorithms" according to Nabors Abstract.

101. **<u>Claim 18 is rejected</u>** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Nabors and Edgecombe.

102. Claim 18 depends from Claim 15, with one additional limitation.

103. Belk does not expressly disclose the additional limitation:

104. **charge variation function is a smooth function of spatial location** is disclosed by Edgecombe at Column 12 line 32 "smooth function".

105. **At the time** the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Nabors and Edgecombe to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because "The preferred principal characteristics that we want in our interpolant are robustness and smoothness" according to Edgecombe Column

12 line 36, and "because the accelerated method is substantially faster than standard algorithms" according to Nabors Abstract.

106. **Claim 19 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Nabors.

107. Claim 19 depends from Claim 19, with one additional limitation.

108. Belk does not expressly disclose the additional limitation:

109. **conductive geometry generator iteratively creates said conductive geometry** is disclosed by Nabors at Abstract "iterative".

110. **At the time** the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Nabors to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this "because the accelerated method is substantially faster than standard algorithms" according to Nabors Abstract.

111. **Claim 20 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Nabors.

112. Claim 20 depends from Claim 15, with one additional limitation.

113. Belk does not expressly disclose the additional limitation:

114. **said charge variation function generator employs a generalized minimal residual-based Krylov method to determine said multidimensional charge variation function** is disclosed by Nabors at Abstract "Krylov-subspace iterative algorithm".

115. **At the time** the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Nabors to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to do this "because the accelerated method is substantially faster than standard algorithms" according to Nabors Abstract.

116. **<u>Claim 21 is rejected</u>** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belk in view of Dufour and Nabor.

117. Claim 21 depends from Claim 15, with one additional limitation.

118. Belk does not expressly disclose the additional limitation:

119. **said conductive geometry is represented in an octtree** is disclosed by Dufour at Column 2 line 6 "octree subdividion of the 3D space"".

120. **At the time** the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Dufour and Nabor to modify Belk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because "octrees are an efficient representation for many volumetric objects since there is a large degree of coherence between adjacent voxels in a typical object" according to Dufour at Column 2 line 14.

<u>Additional Cited Prior Art</u>

121. The following US patents or publications have been cited as prior art, but have not been used for rejection. Applicant should review these carefully before responding to this office action.

122. **Kapur** et al., US Patent 6,051,027 filed July 16, 1998, discloses "decouple the computation of the far field from the layer structure and circuit geometry, minimizing computation time" at Abstract.

123. **Kapur** et al., US Patent 6,314,545 filed Nov. 6, 1998, discloses "each region is further divided into a plurality of quadrature nodes".

124. **Turkiyyah** et al., US Patent 6,133,921, filed May 23, 1997, discloses "discretizing the space...using quadtrees, octrees, etc.," at Column 1 lines 58-60.

Response to Substantial Amendments-FINAL OFFICE ACTION

125. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

126. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Communication

127. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eduardo Garcia-Otero whose telephone number is 703-305-0857. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 AM to 7:00 PM.

128. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Kevin Teska, can be reached at (703) 305-9704. The fax phone numbers for this group are:

129. (703) 746-7238 --- for communications after a Final Rejection has been made;

130. (703) 746-7239 --- for other official communications; and

131. (703) 746-7240 --- for non-official or draft communications.

132. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

* * * *

KEVIN J. TESKA
SUPERVISORY
PATENT EXAMINER